

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Christopher W. Ramirez, James A. Howell, Jr.
Assignee: Dell Products L.P.
Title: Process for Remote Recovery and Creation of Machine Specific Authentication Keys for Systems
Serial No.: 10/672,130 Filing Date: September 26, 2003
Examiner: Nancy Loan T. Le Group Art Unit: 3621
Docket No.: DC-05161 Customer No.: 33438

Austin, Texas
February 16, 2007

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR § 1.193

Dear Sir:

Applicants submit this Reply Brief pursuant to the Examiner's Answer mailed in this case on December 18, 2006. It is believed that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this Reply Brief, however, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct any amounts required for this Reply Brief and to credit any amounts overpaid to Deposit Account No. 502264.

In response to Applicants' argument that Horstmann does not teach or suggest linking the promotion code value with the value that uniquely identifies the information handling system, the Examiner sets forth:

Accordingly, the prior art by Horstmann teaches a 'license certificate' [identified by a unique 'license number' - col. 4 line 6, col. 5 line 35] -- i.e., a promotion code value -- created specifically for and stored on the end-user's machine [or hardware device] during original installation of a software product at purchase (col. 3 lines 12-15) to identify or describe a post-purchase benefit of re-installation/re-download and re-licensing of electronically distributed software that is often bound to a particular machine by computing a quantity known as a 'machine ID', either from a 'serial number' of one of the machine components that is known to be unique or from a sufficient number of machine characteristics such that the ID is statistically unique. If the software is moved to another machine, the software recognizes the change in machines and will not run/execute (col. 2 lines 42-49). Furthermore, in order for the re-installation/re-download

and re-licensing of electronically distributed software to take place, the promotion code value and the 'machine ID' are validated/authenticated beforehand (col. 5 lines 4-16) (see Appendix A). For this reason, Horstmann clearly teaches 'linking the promotion code value with the value that uniquely identifies the information handling system'. (Examiner's Answer, Pages 13 and 14, emphasis omitted.)

However, Horstmann does not teach or suggest that the linking the promotion code value with the value that uniquely identifies the information handling system occurs within *an order management system*, as claimed in claims 1 and 11.

For the above reasons, as well as the reasons set forth in the Appeal Brief, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1 – 26 are unfounded and should be reversed.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on February 16, 2007.

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Stephen A. Terrile
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,946